

1 SAMUEL R. MAIZEL (Bar No. 189301)  
2 samuel.maizel@dentons.com  
3 TANIA M. MOYRON (Bar No. 235736)  
4 tania.moyron@dentons.com  
5 AHMED (“ANDY”) R. JINNAH (Bar No. 297907)  
6 andy.jinnah@dentons.com  
7 DENTONS US LLP  
8 601 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2500  
9 Los Angeles, California. 90017-5704  
10 Telephone: (213) 623-9300  
11 Facsimile: (213) 623-9224  
12

13 ANDREW T. SOLOMON (*admitted pro hac vice*)  
14 asolomon@solomoncramer.com  
15 SOLOMON & CRAMER LLP  
16 1441 Broadway, Suite 6026  
17 New York, New York 10018  
18 Telephone: (212) 884-9102  
19 Facsimile: (516) 368-3896  
20

21 Attorneys for Plaintiff Matthew Pliskin,  
22 as Trustee of the ICPW Nevada Trust  
23

24  
25 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
26 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA (WESTERN DIVISION)**  
27

28 MATTHEW PLISKIN, AS TRUSTEE OF THE  
ICPW NEVADA TRUST

Plaintiff,

-against-

ROBERT GOLDSTEIN and DRG STRATEGIC,  
LLC d/b/a/ MERIDIAN GLOBAL,  
Defendants.

Case. No.: 2:18-cv-09491-FMO(ASx)

**RESPONSE TO (IN CHAMBERS)  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE RE:  
DISMISSAL RE: LACK OF  
PROSECUTION**

Plaintiff Matthew Pliskin, in his capacity as Trustee of the ICPW Nevada Trust (“Plaintiff”  
or the “Trust”), respectfully submits this Response to the Court’s (In Chambers) *Order to Show  
Cause Re: Dismissal Re: Lack of Prosecution*, dated January 8, 2019, ECF No. 12 (the “Order to

Show Cause”). Because the Trust has been diligent in pursuing this matter and any apparent delay or inaction on the part of the Trust has been due solely to the Trust’s good-faith attempt to accommodate the Defendants, the matter should not be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

### Response

On November 8, 2018, the Trust filed a Complaint in this Court against Defendants Robert Goldstein and DRG Strategic, LLC,<sup>1</sup> alleging that the Defendants aided and abetted certain faithless officers of the Trust’s predecessor entity, Ironclad Performance Wear Corporation, in the faithless officers’ breaches of their fiduciary duties to the company, and that the Defendants were unjustly enriched thereby. ECF No. 1.

On November 9, 2018, the Clerk issued a Summons, ECF No. 6, and the Trust timely served the Defendants with copies of the Summons and Complaint in accordance with F.R.C.P. 4 on November 26, 2018, ECF No. 9. The Defendants were required to respond by December 17, 2018.

On December 5, 2018, Plaintiff’s counsel emailed courtesy copies of the Summons and Complaint to Defendants’ last known attorney of record. The attorney replied that he did not at that time represent either Mr. Goldstein or DRG Strategic, LLC. Decl. of Nathan B. Roberts (“Roberts Decl.”), filed herewith, ¶ 3.

On December 6, 2018, Plaintiff’s counsel emailed courtesy copies of the Summons and Complaint to Defendant Robert Goldstein at his last known email address. Plaintiff’s counsel requested that further correspondence come from Defendants’ attorney. Roberts Decl. ¶ 4.

On December 15, 2018, Defendant Goldstein sent an email to Plaintiff’s counsel using the same email address to which Plaintiff’s counsel sent the Summons and Complaint nine days earlier. In his email, Mr. Goldstein told Plaintiff’s counsel that he had the Summons and Complaint “in hand” after returning from an overseas business trip, but that he had not retained counsel and that he needed more time. Plaintiff’s counsel told Mr. Goldstein that the due date to respond was very soon<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant DRG Strategic, LLC is a Texas limited liability company comprised of two members, one of whom is Defendant Robert Goldstein.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff’s counsel mistakenly told Mr. Goldstein that the due date for Defendants’ response was December 18, 2018, rather than December 17, 2018. Plaintiff’s counsel later corrected the mistake in

1 but that the Trust would agree to stipulate to a 30-day extension if he would agree not to contest  
 2 service of process. Mr. Goldstein told Plaintiff's counsel that he would reply after he had retained  
 3 counsel. Roberts Decl. ¶ 5.

4 On December 20, 2018, Plaintiff's counsel followed up by email with Mr. Goldstein to ask if  
 5 he had retained an attorney. Plaintiff's counsel indicated that the Trust remained willing to grant the  
 6 Defendants a reasonable extension of time, but that "it is necessary that we promptly come to an  
 7 agreement in writing that can be filed with the Court." Mr. Goldstein replied, asserting incorrectly  
 8 that the Trust had already granted him an extension and promising that "you will hear from someone  
 9 representing me soon, barring unforeseen circumstances." Plaintiff's counsel wrote back to make it  
 10 clear to Mr. Goldstein that the parties had not yet reached an agreement regarding any extension,  
 11 which "should be committed to a formal stipulation and filed with the Court, so the Court knows  
 12 what is going on." Plaintiff's counsel asked Mr. Goldstein when he believed he would have an  
 13 attorney. Mr. Goldstein stated in response that he had already met with an attorney to discuss the  
 14 matter and "to expect a response within a few days." Roberts Decl. ¶ 6.

15 On January 7, 2019, Plaintiff's counsel received an email from Defendants' counsel (the  
 16 attorney to whom Plaintiff's counsel previously provided a copy of the Summons and Complaint on  
 17 December 5, 2018) saying that Defendants had retained him to represent them in the present matter.  
 18 Roberts Decl. ¶ 7.

19 On January 8, 2019 Plaintiff's counsel spoke with Defendants' counsel by phone and  
 20 reiterated the offer of the 30-day extension previously made to Mr. Goldstein. Later that day, the  
 21 Court issued its Order to Show Cause. Plaintiff's counsel contacted Defendants' counsel and  
 22 stressed the importance of a prompt response to the Order to Show Cause. Roberts Decl. ¶ 8.

23 On January 11, 2019, the parties entered into a Stipulation to extend the time for Defendants  
 24 to respond to the Complaint by 30 days, which would make Defendants' response to the Complaint  
 25 due on or before January 16, 2019. Roberts Decl. ¶ 9.

26  
 27  
 28 communications with Defendants' attorney. Roberts Decl. ¶ 8. In any event, Defendants did not rely  
 on this date and did not file a response to the Complaint by December 18, 2018.

1 In sum, the Trust has been active and diligent in pursuing the matter and in seeking to move  
2 it forward. After Defendants failed to respond to the Complaint on December 17, 2018, the Trust  
3 did not promptly move to act on that failure for no other reason than to accommodate Defendants'  
4 request for more time to find counsel.

5 **Conclusion**

6 For the reasons stated above, the Court should not dismiss the matter for lack of prosecution.

7  
8 Respectfully,

9  
10 Dated: January 14, 2019

DENTONS US LLP

11 By: /s/ Ahmed ("Andy") R. Jinnah  
Samuel R. Maizel  
12 Tania M. Moyron  
Ahmed ("Andy") R. Jinnah

13  
14 SOLOMON & CRAMER LLP

By: /s/ Andrew T. Solomon  
15 Andrew T. Solomon (*admitted pro hac vice*)

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff Matthew Pliskin, as  
17 Trustee for the ICPW Nevada Trust  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28